

Frequently Asked Questions

1. What type of token is this?

This is its own blockchain.

It is NOT a “pump.fun token on solana” – nor an “ERC20 token on Eth”. It is not “on” anything.

Furthermore, this project aims to eventually replace *every* blockchain (including Tron, Solana, Eth, and even Bitcoin). That is its goal.

2. How will this project launch?

On a specific date (in mid 2026), this project will “hard fork” off of the Bitcoin blockchain.

To check your balance, download our full node software (or wallet software).

3. Which exchanges will support this coin?

Probably, all of them.

Typically, a new Altcoin must pay “listing fees” to an exchange – often millions of dollars. When the exchange “lists” the coin, it becomes a “news item” – it adds legitimacy and liquidity to that Altcoin project.

Our project is different.

First, we do not need any exchanges to “list” it at all. Our software allows you to swap eCash for a number of existing coins (BTC, LTC, XMR, USDT). So, you can first use an exchange to buy BTC, and then swap it cryptographically for eCash.

Second, our project’s L1 is a clone of Bitcoin Core. So it should be very easy for exchanges to use.

Third, we are a hard fork. So, any user with BTC on an exchange (at the time of the fork), will suddenly also “own” eCash. But this eCash will be credited to the exchange. This puts the exchange in an awkward position: either the exchange will “steal” this money for themselves (not likely), or they will credit their users. The easiest way for them to credit their users, is to

just list the coin.

Fourth, our hardfork uses “full transaction replay”. Meaning: even after the two chains split apart, 99% of the *new txns* will be “replayed” (since they are valid on both networks). For regular users this is harmless. But for exchanges, it may be illegal – when a user withdraws BTC, exchanges might accidentally send them an equal amount of eCash (without realizing it). Our software makes it easy to control this – but if the exchange is already going to integrate with our software, and track it in their accounting system, then they may decide to just list the coin. (Especially if other exchanges have already listed it.)

So, my guess is that all exchanges will support the coin, quickly.

4. Do you have enough hashrate lined up to support the coin?

Yes.

More importantly: this question is based on a misunderstanding.

Our hard fork will be triggered by a one-time instantaneous drop in difficulty (to its minimum value). This means that –for the first 2016 blocks– it will be easy for regular people to CPU mine.

For a few days, it will be chaotic. Thousands of blocks will be found, and the difficulty will rocket back upwards. It will reach a new equilibrium, with a difficulty value that is proportional to the USD value of the blockreward.

At that point, this network will be no different than any other PoW network. Blocks will come in, roughly every 10 minutes. Miners will mine – to make a profit. There is no need to “line up” miners. (And there would be no way of forcing them to stay loyal to us, anyway.)

5. But won't the hashrate be low? How do you prevent a 51% attack (from BTC miners, for example)?

Several reasons:

1. Notably, BitcoinSV was never 51% attacked. Even though Bitcoiners hated it and its hashrate was very low (less than 0.5%).
2. When the network is young, users are more forgiving of “checkpointing”. (After all, the creation of the network is itself a checkpoint.) The possibility of checkpointing, serves as an effective deterrent.

3. Such an attack would draw more attention to the project (ie, the Streisand Effect).
4. BTC miners are hard to wrangle. Already they are too lazy to act in their own financial interest. So why would they suddenly act in a risky, expensive way for no benefit?
5. Since eCash is Sha256d mined, the more likely outcome is that 256d miners *support* eCash. If eCash does well, then their ASICs increase in value.

6. What about developers? And ecosystem partners?

This question is again based on a misunderstanding.

In a typical Altcoin, such as Ethereum or Solana, there will be large “developer grant” programs. Money will be allocated to “fund developers”, to entice them to build on the Altcoin, and develop impressive-sounding projects.

These programs are *highly overrated*, at best. Often, they are counterproductive or even ruinous.

They are centrally planned. They involve “applications”, and committees. They are inherently political – and distracting. Good developers usually are not good grant-writers. A large grant, given to A for XYZ, will *discourage* B who was working on QRS. True geniuses (working on genuinely new problems), will be misunderstood and underappreciated at first. The developer’s focus should be on the *user* – not a committee.

Instead, a true developer is motivated by *autonomy* and by *creative problem-solving*. That is exactly what our sidechain model already provides. We are shipping the project with a number of cool, user-friendly, *actually useful* L2s that *already work*. They will be operational during the time of the fork. A skilled developer can *fork these* L2s, and make a new project. They will be the “benevolent dictator” of their own kingdom. *That* is what actually attracts developers: the opportunity to solve a problem – and to solve it in their own way. (Without having to explain or justify themselves to anyone.)

Plus, sidechains have an *impressiveness and nobility*. You cannot use a sidechain to launch a new coin – so you cannot use it to pump and dump – and so, the sidechain R&D community will always be *a serious place*, free of grifters. It will naturally attract *the most talented people* – those with something important to contribute.

Nonetheless, we have had *tremendous* success with the “contest model” (see [here](#) and [here](#)). So, that is certainly something we will continue.

Finally, remember that we are keeping our L1 identical to Bitcoin Core. So, any “upgrades” Bitcoin Core makes – we will automatically inherit. We will inherit all that R&D, for free. That *by itself*, is already more development than 99% of Altcoins get.

7. Why will this project be any good?

It addresses the top problems of the industry: scalability and governance.

It address the tension between *innovation* and *conservatism*. It allows people to disagree, and “leave” the software, without leaving the currency. It restores competition, to an arena which has [grown complacent](#). It recaptures all the useful R&D in the industry, granting it all to one coin.

Our success is not guaranteed. It will depend on *who joins the network*, and when.

8. What about Quantum Resistance? Will you take this opportunity to fix quantum vulnerability?

Our L1 aims to be an identical copy of Bitcoin Core. So, if/when they fix it, we will merge those changes.

We do have a Quantum Resistant L2, ready to use today. It is called “Photon”.

Bip300 (which governs the L2 deposits and withdrawals) is already quantum proof, because it does not use cryptographic signatures.

In general, most users should be “L2 only”. We allow people to onboard directly to a QR L2, without going through L1. This means fewer people are trapped on a quantum vulnerable L1, during a time of crisis. This helps avoid a “stampede” of desperate users, rushing quickly to convert their UTXOs to QR.

In a Bip300 world, all your eggs are not in one basket. It is theoretically possible for quantum to kill some chains and leave others unscathed. Paranoid users who safeguarded their UTXOs in a QR L2, would be vindicated. As long as L1 becomes QR eventually, it will still be possible to move coins among the different L2s. The failed L2s will die off, and new L2s will be created to replace them.